UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/562,951	04/20/2006	Brian Anderton	0380-P03923US0	8723
110 7590 03/22/2010 DANN, DORFMAN, HERRELL & SKILLMAN			EXAMINER	
1601 MARKET STREET SUITE 2400 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-2307			STEADMAN, DAVID J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1656	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/22/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/562,951	ANDERTON ET AL.			
zxammer muacoa meerrion cammary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	David J. Steadman	1656			
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>afte</u>	Status of Application: after final rejection			
(1) <u>David J. Steadman</u> .	(3)				
(2) <u>Kathleen Rigaut</u> .	(4)				
Date of Interview: 21 January 2010	Time: approximately 2 PM				
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: .	cant's representative)				
Part I.					
Rejection(s) discussed:					
Claims discussed: 22, 27					
Prior art documents discussed:					
Part II.					
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet					
Part III.					
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summand</li> </ul>	he examiner will provide a written record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview			
/David J. Steadman/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1656	(Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)			

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted Ms. Rigaut to notify applicant's representative that the after-final amendment filed on 1/12/10 would not be entered and to explain the reasons for non-entry. The examiner noted that while the amendment to claim 22, which was the single claim discussed during the interview of 1/7/10, does not appear to require further consideration and a new search, the amendment to claim 27 would require further consideration and a new search. The examiner noted that claim 27 as filed on 2/3/09 encompasses the alternative limitations a "fragment" or a "derivative" of "full length tau protein" of SEQ ID NO:2 and the 103(a) rejection is based on a fusion of full length tau protein of SEQ ID NO:2 with a polyhistidine tag as being encompassed by a "fragment or derivative of full length tau protein". However, the examiner noted that claim 27 as filed on 1/12/10 is amended to delete the alternative "derivative" such that the claim is now limited to "a fragment of SEQ ID NO:2", which excludes a full length tau protein of SEQ ID NO:2 with the addition of a polyhistidine tail. The examiner noted that by limiting the claim to "a fragment of SEQ ID NO:2" in claim 27, at least a new search is required.